

be barred from filing any more lawsuits until he first posts a \$100 frivolity bond, from which the Court will subtract \$100 for the next frivolous lawsuit that he files. And if that does not work, then stronger remedies may be required. See *Chapman v. Executive Committee of U.S. Dist. Court for N. Dist. of Illinois*, 324 F. App'x 500, 502 (7th Cir.2009) (court executive committee's order directing destruction of any papers submitted either directly or indirectly by or on behalf

of vexatious pro se litigant was not an abuse of discretion; order was not an absolute bar since it contained a provision under which the restriction might be lifted, and filing bar was also narrowly tailored to litigant's abuse of the courts).¹ No litigant may clog this Court with repeated, frivolous filings. *Wilkerson*, 2009 WL 4609603 at * 2.

Id. at 3-4.

Robbins filed this lawsuit -- similarly frivolous like his *Universal Motown* case as well as the cases identified in that *Universal Motown* Report and Recommendation -- the next day. It, too, should be **DISMISSED**, and the same sanction should apply.²

SO REPORTED AND RECOMMENDED this 29th day of June, 2011.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

¹ The *Chapman* court distinguished *Miller v. Donald*, 541 F.3d 1091 (11th Cir. 2008), which disapproved of a similar order entered by this Court imposing a permanent bar on an abusive prisoner litigant.

² For jurisdictional purposes only, however, the Court **GRANTS** his *in forma pauperis* motion. Doc. 2.